

National Collaborative Outreach Programme Guidance for consortia

For further information email ncop@hefce.ac.uk, or phone 0117 931 7280.

Purpose

1. This document supplements the original call for submissions to the National Collaborative Outreach Programme¹, and provides further guidance to funded consortia in six sections:

Section 1: Programme funding

Section 2: Monitoring

Section 3: When a consortium fails to deliver

Section 4: Evaluation and tracking

Section 5: Identifying and working with learner cohorts

Section 6: Communications and how HEFCE will work with consortia

Introduction

2. As part of the National Collaborative Outreach Programme (NCOP) we have funded 29 consortia to deliver impartial information, advice and guidance to students in year groups 9 to 13, in 997 wards identified across England². Consortia are collaborative partnerships formed of universities, colleges, schools and third-sector organisations. Many consortia are also using the expertise of local authorities, local enterprise partnerships (LEPs) and other public bodies.

3. Each consortium has appointed an 'accountable' higher education provider to administer the programme funds on behalf of the consortium partners. The design and delivery of activity will be decided by the consortium, which is governed by a governing board or steering group comprising consortium members.

4. This programme builds upon a long tradition of collaborative work to widen participation, most recently the National Networks for Collaborative Outreach (NNCO). The NNCO scheme began in January 2014 and concluded in December 2016. Designed to co-ordinate outreach across all state-funded secondary schools and colleges, the scheme enabled higher education (HE) providers to develop new, firmer strategies for collaboration and innovative approaches to outreach. Capturing the outcomes of the NNCO scheme is an important part of our work, which will incorporate the recommendations and themes arising from the NNCO evaluation report. We expect this to include developmental support to NCOP consortia in building and maintaining collaborative partnerships, and we will hold a workshop in early spring 2017 to begin this work.

¹ Available at www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/201606/.

² See www.hefce.ac.uk/analysis/yp/gaps/.

Section 1: Programme funding

Purpose

5. NCOP funding is provided to enable the members of each consortium to work together to deliver activities which address the Government's ambition of more rapid progress towards increasing the numbers of students from disadvantaged backgrounds entering higher education. The funding should be used only on activities to support this aim through the NCOP.
6. Consortia should consider how the infrastructure put together to support NCOP might co-ordinate and complement the broader outreach offered by partner institutions. By 'broader outreach' we mean outreach delivered using other funding sources, such as the additional fee income committed through access agreements to other groups where such work remains vital, including at primary school level and with adults and the community. We would expect other funding sources to cover the staffing resource necessary to co-ordinate this wider range of outreach within the NCOP infrastructure.
7. The NCOP infrastructure brings together key players in a given local area, which may yield strategic benefits such as linking the aims of consortia to other strategies relating to local growth and skills needs. Operationally, the NCOP will support the capacity of outreach teams in working across large geographical areas, which may enable greater data-sharing, refining and co-ordinating an approach for specific groups.
8. The Office for Fair Access (OFFA) has confirmed the balance between NCOP funding and institution's investments via access agreements as follows.

Funding allocated to institutions under the NCOP should not be included in access agreements. The work set out in an institution's access agreement should complement that being delivered through NCOP, and should look to reach groups that might otherwise be missed such as other areas and age ranges not targeted through NCOP activities.

Additionally, institutions should not lose focus on longer-term sustained outreach. As with access agreement activity, OFFA would encourage an evidence-based approach, with evaluation plans being considered from the beginning of the programme. HEFCE will be co-ordinating a national evaluation but it will be important for consortia to develop their own approaches to evaluation to ensure the scheme has the greatest impact. It is also important that existing work that is already taking place in gaps areas is not disrupted and that consideration is given to how existing work can be built upon.

Access agreements are flexible around the precise detail of outreach activity; there is scope for institutions to change their activities as long as any changes abide by the spirit of the access agreement approved by the Director.

9. If institutions would like to discuss how the work of NCOP impacts on the commitments set out in their access agreements, they are encouraged to contact OFFA by email at enquiries@offa.org.uk, or via their institution's key policy adviser³.

Funding structure

10. The NCOP is a four-year programme and will run in calendar years from January 2017 to December 2020. The first two years of the programme (phase 1) are due to be funded at £60

³ See www.offa.org.uk/contact-us/institutional-contact-list/ for details.

million each calendar year. Funding will be allocated in line with the profiles submitted to HEFCE by consortia in their operating plans in November 2016. Funding and activities have been organised through three tranches, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Tranches of NCOP (phase 1)

Phase 1	
Tranche 1	January 2017 to July 2017
Tranche 2	August 2017 to July 2018
Tranche 3	August 2018 to December 2018

11. We have advised that there will be a 'break point' in the programme at the end of the second calendar year (December 2018). We will consider the options for funding phase 2 of the programme during 2018 utilising optimum evaluation, tracking and monitoring information. We therefore intend during 2018 to make recommendations to our Board. Subject to legislation, the decision will at that point be made by the Board of the Office for Students. We will inform consortia of the Board's decision as soon as possible.

Responsibilities of accountable institution and consortia members

12. Each consortium has designated a 'lead' or 'accountable' institution which is responsible for maintaining close oversight of the funding allocated for its consortium, and its performance against its operating plan. This is also the institution with which HEFCE has the primary relationship in terms of NCOP funding (including managing and auditing accounts) and day-to-day communication about all aspects of the programme. The award letter sent to the head of the accountable institution sets out its formal responsibilities, which are to:

- work with consortium partners to deliver sustained, progressive, intensive outreach activity to the targeted cohorts of learners in the wards identified to fall within the consortium's purview
- be responsible for distribution of and accountability for the funding allocation
- ensure appropriate contracts and agreements with the other partner organisations in the consortium to secure the effective delivery of activity and provide assurance on the appropriate and effective use of programme funding
- coordinate and submit operating plans, monitoring information and end of programme financial assurances to HEFCE on behalf of the consortium in line with our requirements
- engage and communicate with the sector-wide evaluation HEFCE will commission for the programme
- ensure that the terms and conditions of funding, as outlined in the award letter, are met.

13. The responsibilities of partner institutions participating in a consortium are to support the consortium, and the consortium's accountable institution, in meeting the above expectations.

14. Consortia are able to bring in new members as the programme gets underway. Consortium partners who sit on the governing board or steering group should be those organisations involved in design and delivery of activities to support the aims of programme. Consortia will be able to update the partners listed in their operating plans, and letters of support should be sent to ncop@hefce.ac.uk.

15. A copy of the terms and conditions of funding set out in the award letter is at Annex A.

Expenditure under the programme

16. Each consortium has been advised of its funding allocation from HEFCE in its award letter. These allocations are summarised in the table at Annex C and are also available on our website⁴. Each consortium has set a budget for its work as part of its operating plan.

17. Consortia assigned costs to the following budget headings:

- staff costs, including 'on-costs' of staff (salary and pension contributions of no more than 30 per cent for the entire outreach workforce, including student ambassadors and any posts funded in schools)
- outreach events – all costs associated to the delivery of information, advice and guidance and aspiration-raising activities to learners, including any work subcontracted out to other organisations
- research and evaluation – any costs associated with plans to evaluate the work of the consortium, including in-house evaluation as well as externally commissioned work
- tracking costs including membership to the Higher Education Access Tracker (HEAT) or similar mechanisms⁵
- travel and subsistence
- information technology costs including website work
- lead or accountable institution costs
- special funding
- equipment
- marketing
- legal
- accountancy and audit
- printing
- other costs.

⁴ See www.hefce.ac.uk/sas/ncop/

⁵ See <http://heat.ac.uk/>. Some consortia are also members of the East Midlands Widening Participation Research and Evaluation Partnership (www.emwprep.ac.uk/) and the Aimhigher West Midlands tracking system. These systems enable institutions to track the numbers of young people in receipt of outreach activities.

18. Consortia are able to include their consortium membership subscriptions to HEAT or other tracking systems such as the East Midlands Widening Participation Research and Evaluation Partnership (EMWPREP) as an allowable cost. These organisations will provide guidance to their members on the exact basis for this cost which has been agreed with HEFCE. For HEAT members this will be approximately 0.2 per cent of a consortium's allocation. A similar approach will be taken by other providers. Consortium members are not permitted to count their individual institutional subscription to a tracking service as a cost under NCOP. Nor should NCOP funding be used to subsidise costs associated with data entry related to institutional subscriptions.

19. HEFCE will work with HEAT and other tracking providers and consortia in the early part of the programme, to understand the approaches to costing that each consortium has used.

20. It is not a specific aim of this programme that consortia build websites relating to this programme, although they may if it forms part of their approach. Any additional costs attached to updating and maintaining related web pages, applications or other technical aids can be captured as allowable costs.

21. Consortia are permitted to spend some of their budget on marketing costs, including branding or promotion of their work, where this will directly benefit the successful delivery of activities as part of a consortium's approach. We do not encourage the use of branded materials (for example umbrellas or mugs) which play no part in activities provided to young learners.

22. Payments to support redundancy are not allowable costs under this programme. This is because we would need to divert funds away from the delivery of activities to create a fund for this purpose. Funding for the NCOP is provided for a fixed period of time and consortia should manage contracts with staff appointed for this work to accommodate this timescale.

23. Consortia are permitted to use NCOP funds to cover maternity, paternity and adoption leave costs should they arise. This is an allowable cost under NCOP funding.

Subcontracting

24. Consortia can commission other organisations to deliver activity on their behalf as part of this programme. However, the consortium steering group and the accountable institution will remain fully accountable to us for the funding and delivery of all of the consortium's activity. Consortium governing boards should monitor the risks and mitigations of such arrangements so that they are reassured. A number of consortia are planning to subcontract activity out to other bodies, including third-sector organisations which have particular expertise, and we will be interested to understand the benefits of such arrangements. It is likely that the national evaluation team will also be interested in understanding innovative models of delivery.

Intellectual property

25. Governing boards need to consider how they will develop resources across the consortia, and decide how any intellectual property will be managed between partners. We would expect consortia to share the effective practice and resources they develop with other NCOP consortia, and will put in place mechanisms to enable this dissemination.

26. One method of dissemination will be the newly created Resource Pool⁶. Developed to share resources and practice developed under the NNCO scheme, this web-based repository enables consortia to upload media in a range of formats. Further information relating to this is at Annex D. Consortia will wish to review the advice relating to intellectual property to ensure that the resources they develop may be shared more widely.

Programme risk

27. All consortia have set out a risk analysis as part of their operating plan. We are predominantly interested in strategic risks to the partnership itself and to the success of the consortium in achieving the objectives it has defined for itself. We do not encourage consortia to be risk-averse; for example, we welcome the delivery of innovative activity where it can be effectively evaluated. Every consortium will wish to capture a mixture of risks and opportunities within and outside its control. We would expect a consortium governing board to receive updates on the risks to the consortium as part of its assessment of the consortium's progress against its plans.

28. An assessment of risk will be captured through programme monitoring and evaluation, but we encourage consortia to make us aware of changes to risk which may affect their work (as described in paragraph 6c of the award letter terms and conditions reproduced in Annex A).

Section 2: Monitoring

29. The purpose of monitoring is to enable us to:

- understand how the programme aims are being met
- gain assurance about programme funding
- integrate monitoring information with the programme's formative evaluation, including seeking information about value for money and return on investment.

30. Monitoring of the programme will take the form of quarterly financial updates to ensure that financial profiles and budgets are on track, coupled with twice-yearly updates on consortia's progress against their project plans, objectives and milestones. The June monitoring point will be an opportunity to review progress during the year, and the 'end of year' December monitoring point will be a fuller review of information, including all that set out in the operating plan.

31. The dates for the monitoring updates due at the end of each quarter are set out in Table 2. All monitoring returns will be due to us by noon on the submission date. Returns will be made via the HEFCE extranet, building on the process to populate and submit each consortium's operating plan. Technical guidance on how to populate and submit the first financial update in March 2017 and the June 2017 in-year monitoring update, along with example copies, will be issued to consortia in January 2017, as the programme gets underway.

⁶ The Resource Pool will be published in January 2017, when we will make the weblink available to consortia.

Table 2: Dates of NCOP monitoring points, 2017-18

Quarter 1	January to March 2017	Friday 31 March	Financial update	
Quarter 2	April to June 2017	Friday 30 June	Financial update	In-year update
Quarter 3	July to September 2017	Friday 29 September	Financial update	
Quarter 4	October to December 2017	Thursday 21 December	Financial update	End of year monitoring
Quarter 5	January to March 2018	Friday 30 March	Financial update	
Quarter 6	April to June 2018	Friday 29 June	Financial update	In-year update
Quarter 7	July to September 2018	Friday 28 September	Financial update	
Quarter 8	October to December 2018	Thursday 20 December	Financial update	End of year monitoring

Quarterly financial update

32. The intention of this monitoring process is to:

- check that the financial profile is on track and appropriate given the consortium's project plan and progress
- manage funding actively where slippage has occurred, through reprofiling and action plans where necessary
- prompt further discussion about how the consortium is getting on, involving other partners as necessary.

33. The monitoring will be against the information provided in the most recent version of the payment profile and budget (worksheets 2 and 3 of the operating plan). Consortia will be asked to set out with commentary how much of the funding has been spent by the submission date in Table 2. We use 'spent' to refer to funds that have been spent, with the related purchased goods and services received, as part of the delivery of the programme. This monitoring point will not record committed spending, as we expect that to appear as spent funds at the next appropriate quarterly monitoring point. We will also require each consortium to provide an update on the budget, including further detail where funding has been classified as 'other' or where any budget lines have been under or over-forecast.

34. Any slippage in expenditure will be managed in discussion with the consortium's account manager, who may advise that funding allocations be reprofiled if the amount of underspending is of material value. By 'material value' we mean more than 10 per cent of the total allocation for that quarter. Underspent funds under that amount will be rolled over into the next quarter and monitored subsequently. All instances of underspending will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and take into account the rationale or explanation provided by the consortium.

35. Where reprofiling is considered necessary we will request a reprofile plan setting out how future payments should be scheduled so that funding levels are actively managed. A reprofile would typically take the form of stopping a number of future monthly funding allocations, with the remaining payments either staying the same or being modified so that funding allocations and quarterly outgoings get back to a manageable equilibrium. If the financial update points to a bigger issue of slippage in activity against the project plan, we will hold a conversation with the consortium via step 1 of the process set out in Section 3.

In-year update (June 2017 and 2018)

36. Along with the financial update, the June monitoring point is an opportunity to capture an in-year update on the progress of consortia against their project plan, objectives and milestones (worksheets 4 and 5a). Further technical guidance will be issued in January, but this is likely to take the form of a red-amber-green (RAG) rating to show progress against the plans set out in those worksheets, with further explanatory detail as commentary.

37. We will use this information as the basis for further discussion, for example where we need to be aware of specific issues, difficulties or themes, as well as analysis which pulls together themes for the programme as a whole.

End of year monitoring (December 2017 and 2018)

38. Along with the financial update and twice-yearly assessment of progress against a consortium's project plan, objectives and milestones, the end of year monitoring point will also provide an opportunity to reflect on progress and update us against all the information in the operating plan.

39. Consortia will be able to amend the information across all the worksheets in the operating plan, to ensure that it remains current and fit for purpose. However, we would not expect overall objectives to change substantially.

40. This monitoring return will also contain a request for an update on:

- approaches to building a learner progression framework, and the benefits and challenges of specific types of activities, including innovative activity
- the extent to which all wards within a consortium's purview are covered, and any challenges or opportunities that have arisen
- any other updates about the programme, not provided through the evaluation.

41. We are also discussing with leads from the tracking schemes (HEAT, the East Midlands Widening Participation Research and Evaluation Partnership (EMWPREP) and Aimhigher West Midlands) mechanisms to allow us to measure expenditure by individual activity and learner. These conversations will continue into the New Year of 2017 and are likely to lead to a pilot phase of monitoring. We will advise consortia accordingly as discussions continue.

42. Further information about the requirements and instructions to complete this monitoring round will be provided in June 2017.

Section 3: When a consortium fails to deliver

43. Consortia should refer to the content of the award letter, specifically paragraphs 6 to 8 of the terms and conditions reproduced in Annex A which confirm the circumstances in which we would withhold or suspend payment of funds or require repayment, that is:

- a. the funds are used for purposes other than those for which they have been awarded;
- b. the consortium does not ultimately proceed, changes significantly or is excessively delayed;
- c. delivery of work as set out in the operating plan does not start in January 2017 and the consortium fails to provide us with a reasonable explanation for the delay;
- d. we consider that the consortium is not making the progress required against its targets and milestones and other plans as set out in its operating plan;
- e. we consider that the consortium's work is being delivered in a negligent manner;
- f. funding is obtained from a third party which, in our reasonable opinion, undertakes activities that are likely to bring the consortium or HEFCE into disrepute;
- g. the consortium provides us with information which is materially misleading or inaccurate;
- h. we consider that further payment would place public funds at risk.

44. We will capture financial monitoring information on a quarterly basis, and fuller information about progress on a twice-yearly basis. We expect to engage regularly with consortia through account managers (a list is provided at Annex C), and we encourage consortia to keep them abreast of progress. We will capture this intelligence as well as the information gathered through our formal meetings with consortia. We will also receive data on consortia's progress through the evaluation.

45. Where we have concerns about the use of the funding, we will in the first instance contact the accountable institution to investigate further, as set out in the terms and conditions in the award letter. HEFCE reserves the right to audit any funding it allocates, and we would do this through the accountable institution with responsibility for the funding.

46. If any consortium member or the consortium governing board encounters an issue that they feel unable to resolve, then HEFCE is prepared to support that consortium by brokering or mediating a meeting and subsequent resolution or action. Equally, consortium members are able to contact HEFCE via their account manager or Regional Consultant if they wish to bring an issue to our attention⁷.

A step-based approach

47. We recognise that plans may change and that there may be unavoidable slippage in progress or a delay in programme activity or expenditure. We will always work flexibly with consortia, taking a risk-based approach to supporting consortia in meeting their own objectives

⁷ See www.hefce.ac.uk/contact/search/ for a searchable list of HEFCE staff.

and the aim of the programme. The following steps set out our approach to working with a consortium when things do not go to plan.

48. **Step 1:** Where we become aware of issues of significant slippage in progress against a consortium's operating plan through informal updates or programme monitoring, we will, in the first instance, arrange a discussion with the chair of the consortium's governing board, the consortium manager and a representative from the lead institution (if this person is not the chair). This will be to understand the issues around the consortium's lack of progress and what the consortium is doing to address it. We will ask the consortium to draw up an action plan setting out those tasks which will get it back on track in a specified timeframe. We will also reprofile funds if this forms part of the action plan approach.

49. **Step 2:** We will expect regular updates, via the account manager, on the implementation of the consortium's action plan. If it appears that the timescales or tasks within it are not on track, or if the original action plan was in response to a significant issue, then we will also engage the HEFCE Regional Consultant for the lead institution. Their role will be to engage with the lead institution and ensure that strategic resource is provided to ensure the consortium's progress is brought back into line, against the expectations set out in an updated action plan and the consortium's original operating plan.

50. **Step 3:** A consortium is persistently failing if it has not delivered on its action plan, and is significantly behind in or repeatedly underperforming against its objectives and project plan. In this case we will consider withdrawing funding and recommissioning the related wards. This will be taken forward through a meeting of the NCOP team, the Regional Consultant for the lead institution and representatives of the lead institution and consortium. Subsequent steps will be taken forward through notice to the head of the accountable institution, and the HEFCE Executive or Board where necessary.

51. Correspondence for all steps will be issued by the consortium account manager and sent to the consortium lead contact, consortium chair and lead institution representative.

52. We would not expect a consortium that is in step 3 above to move forward into phase 2 of the programme. However, we will take into account the performance of all consortia in considering the options for the programme's progression into phase 2.

Section 4: Evaluation and tracking

53. Through the focus on evidencing impact and success we intend to make a 'step change' in the sector's approach to measuring and evidencing the outcomes and impact of its outreach work, and our ability to demonstrate this in the context of a national programme. We need to be able to demonstrate which interventions (in which contexts, and with which learners) have been instrumental in delivering progress, and which could have the most impact in the longer term. The evaluation for NCOP is being undertaken in this context, and our approach to evaluation builds on the work undertaken by CFE Research for HEFCE in 2015⁸.

What we will evaluate

54. The overall aim of the national evaluation is to assess how successfully the programme is driving rapid progress towards its overall objective to increase participation of disadvantaged

⁸ See www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/sodataret/ and www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/sodepth/.

learners in the specific local areas where HE participation is low overall and lower than expected given GCSE attainment levels. As well as considering the programme objectives themselves, the evaluation will also need to consider:

- a. The developing context of education, including the impact and implications of broader sectoral changes such as level 3 qualification reform, emerging schools policy, further education area reviews, growth in apprenticeship routes, and any broader political and structural changes that occur over the course of the programme.
- b. Alignment with, and impact on, the broader coverage of outreach activity and investment through access agreements.

55. Success will therefore not just be conceived in terms of the overall changes in numbers, although this will of course be the ultimate test of the programme across the four years. Success will also be judged in terms of how the programme works in its broader context, and of how learner choices and behaviours are affected.

56. We have therefore set ourselves five key objectives:

- to ensure funding is spent according to plan (accountability for public funds)
- to enable an overall assessment of the difference to the student, society and economy outcomes attributable to NCOP funding (impact assessment)
- to demonstrate the value of any impact at individual, provider, consortium, and national levels (return on investment)
- to identify differences between consortium approaches, to see whether these differences are associated with differential participation rates and progress (benchmarking of outcomes)
- to establish the causal effect of different types of NCOP interventions (what works, why and in what circumstances).

57. We have established the following five strands of activity to help us achieve these objectives:

- a. Monitoring and account management, conducted in-house by HEFCE.
- b. Activity commissioned at the local level by individual consortia.
- c. Quantitative analysis of national administrative datasets that will be used to assess target area outcomes in terms of rates of progression into pathways at Key Stage 5, and of HE entry and progression rates. This includes econometric analysis on the return on investment. Again this will be conducted by in-house HEFCE analysts, and the findings and data will be published and shared as they become available.
- d. Longitudinal tracking of cohorts involved in NCOP. All consortia must track their individual target learners through HEAT or a similar mechanism. HEFCE will work with HEAT and other providers to evaluate the impact of particular interventions on NCOP learners.
- e. Externally commissioned work:
 - i. A formative and capacity-building evaluation, with summative reports at key points in the programme. This will include support for consortia in developing and

implementing high-quality evaluation plans that use robust approaches to evaluating outreach activity; and a systematic review of the evidence emerging from consortia.

ii. An impact evaluation that assesses the changes resulting from the diversity of NCOP interventions, using a range of quantitative, experimental methodologies.

58. Full details of the specifications and associated timescales were circulated to consortia in November 2016, and details of successful bids for external work will be made available in January 2017. These specifications set out a broad range of research questions.

59. In all cases we will use emerging findings to provide evidence of progress and success, to support funding decisions for years 3 and 4 of the programme, and to support evidence-based approaches to refining effective practice at the local level.

60. We will work with HEFCE's Teaching Excellence and Student Opportunity Strategic Advisory Committee to oversee the NCOP evaluation programme.

61. We will work closely with the evaluators to ensure timely and effective communication with consortia throughout the evaluation. This will be critical to ensuring that findings are used to influence practice at local level.

Expectations of consortia

62. We have previously advised that the national evaluation is likely to require specific evidence to be gathered consistently across all consortia, so we will expect them to adapt their evaluation strategies to accommodate this. This may also include a requirement to participate in meetings, surveys and visits to lead institutions and partner organisations, as well as stakeholders such as partner schools and colleges, LEPs and local authorities. We may also organise workshops to which we will invite members of consortia.

63. The team we commission to undertake the formative evaluation will be contracted to support consortia in developing and implementing high-quality evaluation plans that use robust approaches to evaluation of outreach activity. Early tasks for the team will therefore be to conduct a critical analysis of the plans, success criteria and evaluation strategies of the full range of consortia, and to work with HEFCE to produce clear and unambiguous guidance and recommendations on how these might be strengthened. We expect the external team to work iteratively and sensitively with each consortium, and in some circumstances might help co-design the local approach. Therefore, although each consortium will be putting evaluation plans in place, a degree of agility and flexibility will be required. We will recognise this need in any monitoring requirements.

64. As the programme progresses, the team appointed will also draw on emerging findings and evidence from consortia. The objective is to undertake some form of systematic review or 'meta-evaluation' of the evaluative outputs of consortia. The team will therefore need to consider how consortia have measured their success, as well as the credibility, validity and reliability of the data used and the evidence produced.

65. A clear set of guidance including requirements for data and information, and associated timescales setting out how the national team will engage with each consortium, will be provided once the teams are commissioned.

Consortia's own evaluation

66. It will be up to each consortium to decide on the most appropriate approach. We recommend that before looking to commission evaluation activity from a third party it fully explores the research capacity in the member institutions' academic departments. Indeed we recognise that many consortia will be looking to 'commission' work in this way internally. For some consortia a third-party organisation will be the appropriate choice.

67. It is certainly acceptable to co-design an approach with an external evaluation team, and consortia may wish to discuss approaches with the national evaluation teams appointed by HEFCE for the overall programme. This may involve a partner organisation whose sole role will be to advise on monitoring and evaluation – although if this were a partner higher education institution there would need to be credible reasons why it would not also be involved in delivery.

68. It would be inappropriate for us to specify the methodological tools or approach each consortium should adopt. We expect that consortia will continue to take account of research and guidance that HEFCE publishes on robust approaches to evidence and evaluation (including the CFE research mentioned in paragraph 52). However, we do not expect consortia to use every possible research methodology, and a balance will need to be achieved between delivering activity and measuring and assessing impact and success.

69. Annex B contains two tables setting out some questions consortia may wish to consider as part of their approach to planning monitoring and evaluation activity.

70. Through the national evaluation we will expect consortia to participate actively in trials and pilot activity of experimental methods, and we will expect to see evidence of how findings and recommendations emerging from the formative evaluation are used to refine outreach activity, as well as the evaluation of these.

71. We expect consortia to share their emerging findings in a transparent manner. Wherever possible the quality of research and evaluation should be assured to a reasonable standard, for instance through peer review. We would encourage consortia to think innovatively of ways to quality-assure, share and publish their research.

Tracking

72. It is a mandatory requirement that all consortia are in a position to track their individual target learners through HEAT or a similar mechanism. In this way we aim to build a picture of successful interventions and approaches across the country. When combined with other evidence, this will allow us to share effective practice across the programme and, where necessary, ensure that any consortium failing to achieve its agreed milestones and targets can adopt other alternative approaches or interventions that have proved effective elsewhere.

73. HEFCE is working with the three main tracking system providers to ensure this is done in a consistent and effective manner. Consortia should work directly with the providers to understand the work they will need to undertake at a local level, and the plans to analyse aggregate data. Consortia should ensure that they are adequately staffed to undertake the data entry and administration for the tracking requirements.

74. Consortia will no doubt be mindful of recent government announcements confirming that the UK will be implementing the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) which comes into effect on 25 May 2018, including requirements for informed consent. We would

expect consortia to seek the advice of their internal experts at the earliest opportunity in order to understand whether these changes will have an impact on their work. HEFCE is not in a position to advise on this area. However, we will ask the national evaluation team to consider any immediate impact of the changes. Consortia may also find the Information Commissioner's website useful⁹.

Section 5: Identifying and working with learner cohorts

A targeted approach

75. To make the rapid progress required to increase access to HE to the level needed to achieve the Government's goals, consortia should focus their work on the older age groups in schools and colleges, which means targeting activity at Key Stage 4 learners from years 9 through to 13. Activities to support other age groups such as learners in primary schools and mature learners, or work in schools not in the purview of the 997 target wards, should be supported through other means, as part of institutions' ongoing work in this area.

76. In terms of an upper age limit, consortia should focus their work only on students under the age of 19 during the academic year of application to HE, so that students who are required to resit a year or miss a year of study do not miss out from such activity.

77. When we recalculated consortia funding taking into account the additional wards we said, in 'Board decisions regarding the NCOP and teaching funding for widening access, successful student outcomes and progression to postgraduate study' (HEFCE Circular letter 27/2016)¹⁰ that, to accommodate the expansion in the funding envelope supplied, consortia could reduce the cohort size with which they work from the previously expected 33 per cent to a minimum of 20 per cent.

78. We accept that some schools may have smaller proportions of students from the identified wards than others, in which case consortia will need to decide where best to direct activity to achieve most impact in terms of narrowing the gap in progression and of achieving best value for money. Consortia will wish to work with schools and colleges outside a gaps ward, a proportion of whose cohorts live in gaps areas. Ideally, all schools servicing gaps areas would receive some level of outreach support.

79. Similarly, in schools in gaps areas where some learners come from other wards which are not gaps areas, we will expect consortia to target those learners living in the gaps area. We understand that some pragmatism will be required to work with schools to build a sensible targeted cohort of young people. Consortia may wish to draw on their broader outreach activity, funded from other sources, to build a full programme for a school.

80. We expect all 997 wards to be considered. No ward should be intentionally 'left behind', although consortia will use their judgement to ascertain the volume and type of activity which can realistically be delivered given the ward's characteristics and available funding. If a consortium is unable to cover any ward then we will transfer that ward (and its associated funding) to another consortium which indicates that it would be able to include it in its programme of activity. In the first instance, consortia should contact their account manager to discuss this further.

⁹ See <https://ico.org.uk/>.

¹⁰ Available at www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL,272016/.

81. The measures of overall success in progressing young people will be to any course of prescribed HE, whatever the mode of study (HND, HNC, foundation degree, degree), and we encourage consortia to consider their offer in terms of information about alternative routes into HE. Including information on progression to higher apprenticeships will also form an important part of the consortia's approach.

Innovation and pilot activity

82. Consortia have been encouraged to consider innovative approaches to outreach delivery, especially where this may yield a rapid positive result compared with existing approaches for some areas or groups of learners.

83. All consortia are expected to be able to evidence the impact of their activity as part of their tracking and approach to evaluation, and they should have some research or other basis on which they feel this type of activity is appropriate, given what they understand of the success of the method of outreach and its suitability to the characteristics of the gaps areas and the communities therein.

84. Equally, pilot approaches are to be encouraged although any pilot activity should be robustly evaluated as part of the consortium's approach and form part of a larger programme of progressive outreach activities. Consortium steering groups will need to monitor the progress of pilot or innovative activity closely, to ensure that the funding is being used effectively and efficiently.

Section 6: Communications and how we will work with consortia

Communications

85. We encourage consortia to share the work they are doing both locally and nationally where appropriate. As part of the programme's announcement in December 2016, press notices, including a press release from HEFCE, were sent to the press team in the accountable higher education provider for each consortia. This notice provided a summary of the geographical and political context of the programme, both locally and nationally. This information can be shared to be used by other partners.

86. We will routinely publish communications about the programme in the form of tweets, blog posts and briefing notes, as well as formal updates through circular letters or published documents and reports. We will always notify consortia when we issue a communication they need to be aware of. Key information that requires action from, or gives guidance to, all consortia will most likely be given via circular letter or a direct formal email to the lead contact at the accountable institution, as identified to us. We will also issue regular updates on the programme, which will take the form of a newsletter for all consortia and a separate newsletter for other stakeholders interested in the programme. We expect that any information sent to an accountable institution from HEFCE will be disseminated to partners in its consortium.

87. HEFCE has issued a number of notices about this programme, and we would encourage consortia to direct their partners and stakeholders to the NCOP webpages which contain links to all of the key information sources. If you have any further queries, or trouble locating a specific piece of information, email ncop@hefce.ac.uk.

Engagement with HEFCE

88. Each consortium will also have the support from an account manager from HEFCE, who should be the first point of contact for consortium. The account manager will oversee the monitoring process and subsequent actions for their portfolio of consortia, as well as communicating with consortia through face-to-face meetings, phone, email and skype or video conferencing. Predominantly, such communication will be with the lead contact for each consortium, but this may include the chair of the steering group and other consortium partners and stakeholders as necessary. A list of the account manager for each consortium is at Annex C.

89. HEFCE is planning to organise and facilitate country-wide meetings approximately every six to eight months. These will provide an opportunity for NCOP board chairs and lead contacts to receive updates on the programme, share practice and discuss strategic approaches to activity. HEFCE will organise other relevant meetings and workshops as required, and will ensure complementarity with events organised by the programme evaluators. Schedules for HEFCE-organised meetings will be released to consortia in 2017.

90. HEFCE will also provide access for all members of consortia to an online discussion forum. This forum will be available to use as a place for sharing practice, documentation or ideas, problem solving and discussing any relevant aspects of their activity. HEFCE will also use this space to discuss certain themes, gather feedback and encourage collaboration. Further details will be announced to consortia in early 2017.

Annex A: Terms and conditions of funding (from consortium award letter, sent to the head of the accountable institution)

Finance and risk

1. As the lead institution, you are receiving an allocation of funding from us to support your consortium which will be part of the National Collaborative Outreach Programme (NCOP). All funding is allocated by the Council in accordance with our statutory powers set out in Section 65 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992.
2. For HEIs we expect the terms of the Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/201612/ to be adhered to in the delivery of the programme.
3. We expect funding for phase 1 of the programme to be organised in three tranches: in January 2017, August 2017 and August 2018. As the consortium lead institution you will set out to us the monthly funding profile through to December 2018 appropriate for your consortium's approach. As consortium lead institution, you will receive the funding.
4. A monthly funding profile must be supplied and quarterly updates on this provided to your HEFCE account manager. Reprofiling of grant will take place where significant slippage occurs.
5. Institutions should ensure that appropriate remuneration is provided to any students employed as part of this programme, however the use of volunteers is appropriate if the volunteers are aware that this is the case.
6. As lead institution you must inform us promptly in writing (that is, outside the agreed reporting timescale if appropriate) if:
 - a. There is a significant alteration to your operating plan or a matter arises which is likely to significantly affect the intended aims, outcomes and/or outputs.
 - b. There are delays in starting or implementing your activity or your intended programme of work is put on hold for any reason.
 - c. There are any significant changes to risk status of your work. Where the level of risk increases significantly during the project life, we should be advised at the earliest reasonable opportunity (that is, outside the agreed reporting system if appropriate).
7. We reserve the right to change the funding and monitoring arrangements if, in our judgement, any of the above matters mean that your consortium is unlikely to achieve its intended outcomes. We also reserve the right to take these courses of action if, in our judgement, you fail to report any of the above issues to us in writing in a prompt manner.
8. We reserve the right to withhold or suspend payment of the funds and/or require repayment of all or part of the funding if:
 - a. The funds are used for purposes other than those for which they have been awarded.
 - b. The consortium does not ultimately proceed, changes significantly or is excessively delayed.
 - c. Delivery of work as set out in your operating plan does not start in January 2017 and you fail to provide us with a reasonable explanation for the delay.

- d. We consider that the consortium is not making the progress required against its targets and milestones and other plans as set out in its operating plan.
- e. We consider that the consortium's work is being delivered in a negligent manner.
- f. Funding is obtained from a third party which, in our reasonable opinion, undertakes activities that are likely to bring the consortium or HEFCE into disrepute.
- g. You provide us with information which is materially misleading or inaccurate.
- h. We consider that further payment would place public funds at risk.

9. Before taking any such action we will, in the first instance, arrange a discussion with the Chair of the consortium's governance board and the consortium manager or director to discuss these concerns and put in place a plan of action where the withdrawal of funds will be a last resort, unless immediate action is required in order to safeguard public funds.

10. Where any sum fails to be repaid to us in connection with the allocation, we may recover that sum by way of set-off against any other sum payable by us to you. Under no circumstances will the amount of the allocation be increased in the event of any overspend in the delivery of your work.

Monitoring and evaluation

11. An operating plan must be supplied and you are required to fulfil our monitoring requirements for this programme. As discussed in the main body of the letter, we will require quarterly financial updates and bi-annual monitoring with a fuller monitoring return being returned at the end of each calendar year. Monitoring will be conducted against the information set out in the consortium's operating plan. We will confirm the procedure and arrangements for monitoring in our forthcoming briefing document to be published in December 2016.

12. Your consortium is also expected to engage with the NCOP evaluation which will commence in January 2017.

13. Your institution will be expected to engage with your allocated HEFCE account manager who will assess whether the consortium is meeting its targets and milestones as well as ensuring the consortium's funding profile is appropriate.

14. Funding will be allocated on the basis of a profile. If there is slippage in your consortium's spending then we will pick this up through monitoring or please contact us to make us aware that this is the case. In case of slippage, we will work with you to put in place a plan of action to ensure that the funds are re-profiled so that payments are appropriate for your needs. This may involve suspending one month's payment or reprofiling the amounts of future payments.

15. As set out in paragraph 9 above, we will discuss with you if frequent reprofiling raises concerns that the consortium is not delivering against its operating plan.

16. The final monitoring return for phase 1 is due in December 2018 and consortia should ensure that all funding associated with this programme is spent by the end of the monitoring period, that is 31 December 2018. Unspent monies are likely to be recouped at that point.

17. We reserve the right to suspend, terminate or recover the funding allocation if our monitoring requirements are not met. Additionally, monitoring requirements agreed at the outset

of the programme are subject to adjustment by us upon receipt of progress reports or for any other reasonable cause. We will consult with the lead institution before changing any monitoring requirements.

18. It is your responsibility to closely monitor the delivery and success of the consortium to ensure that HEFCE's minimum expectations for the programme are met. Other aims and objectives for the consortium's activities are the responsibility of the lead institution and constituent partners. We expect appropriate governance and monitoring arrangements to be in place for this collaborative work.

19. You will need to keep separate, accurate up-to-date accounts and records of the receipt and expenditure of the funding. We will have the right to review these accounts and records and to take copies of them as part of an audit if we feel this is required.

Programme evaluation

20. As well as the monitoring and evaluation requirements set out in paragraphs 11 to 19, we require every consortia to engage and communicate with the sector-wide evaluation we will undertake for this programme. The evaluation team will be commissioned during autumn 2016 and we will let consortia know who has been appointed to undertake this work once contracts are in place. We will alert consortia to the tender documentation for information.

21. The team appointed will design and execute a systematic and wide-ranging evaluation which will utilise a range of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, and will work closely with HEFCE analysts. The evaluation is likely to involve the use of experimental models (such as randomised control trials) and quasi experimental models, assisting consortia to trial new methods of evaluation. It will have both formative and summative elements, and will take full account of recommendations from the CFE Research for HEFCE in 2015 to build the foundations and conceptual basis of an evaluation framework¹¹. The NCOP national evaluation is an opportunity to commission work which takes full account of the recommendations in this report and makes a 'step change' in ours and the sector's approach to measuring and evidencing outcomes and impact in this area.

22. The team appointed will contact your consortium's key contact to take forward this work. We expect the team to provide a clear set of timescales and guidance to consortia about how the national team will engage with each consortium, and likely requirements for data and information.

23. This may include a requirement to participate in meetings, surveys and visits to your institution and partner organisations as well as stakeholders such as partner schools and colleges, LEPs and Local Authorities. We may also organise workshops to which we will invite members of your consortium.

24. The evaluation team will also use research and evaluation conducted at the local level to inform the wider findings of the evaluation to assess the outcomes and added value of these collaborative arrangements. We plan to provide key documentation about each consortia (including your submission and operating plan) to the external team appointed as part of the contract.

¹¹ See www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/sodataret/ and www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/sodepth/.

25. HEFCE analysts will conduct analysis of the programme as it progresses to establish the effectiveness nationally of the NCOP programme in increasing HE participation in the target wards. This will involve consideration of progression rates into pathways at key stage 5, as well as application and progression rates into and through HE.

End of funding reporting

26. You are required to fulfil our end of award reporting and financial assurance requirements for the programme. We will set out these requirements at least six months before the information is due.

27. This monitoring information is likely to take a similar form as the first monitoring return but may include some additional questions around sustainability and reflections following the end of the programme.

28. We will provide a financial assurance template at the end of the funded programme which should be signed by an appropriate senior manager. We would also look to recoup any unspent monies at that point.

Complying with state aid and other relevant legislation

29. You should ensure that funding provided is used in ways compatible with relevant legislation. This includes state aid and equality legislation. If necessary, institutions should seek legal advice to inform their delivery of the consortia.

Publicity

30. We will issue guidance around NCOP branding, including a logo, as soon as possible. We will request that you use this logo on new resources, materials, web-sites and web-resources developed by the consortia.

31. A press pack will be made available ahead of the programme launch event on 24 January 2017.

32. You should contact our communications team on 0117 931 7035 to advise of any upcoming media coverage of NCOP consortia, including that before January 2017. HEFCE's contribution to the consortium should be acknowledged in press releases, which should also make reference to the wider NCOP programme.

33. We reserve the right to publish some or all of your final report on our website (and any other outputs from the programme, including the evaluation), as part of disseminating the findings of monitoring and evaluation for the benefit of the sector. We would contact you ahead of doing this. We will also use these outputs for internal purposes, such as policy development. If you believe the report or elements of it, are confidential and should not be published, you should state the reasons why in advance and we will consider them.

Relationship

34. These terms and conditions do not create any partnership or joint venture between us and you, nor any relationship of principal and agent.

Annex B: The relationship between monitoring and evaluation

1. Monitoring is essentially concerned with accountability and performance against milestones, and will be supplemented through intelligence and information gathered in the ongoing account management relationship between each consortium and HEFCE. The evaluation is predominantly concerned with evidencing outcomes and impact. It will therefore need to consider the key factors that have influenced whether consortia are successful, and to ascertain the immediate and potential longer-term economic, social and cultural benefits.

2. The tables in this annex set out some of the ways that the monitoring and evaluation of NCOP are related, through some example questions each may consider.

Aspect	Monitoring will measure	Evaluation will measure
Funding and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much has been spent? • Is the expenditure timely in terms of the spending plan on budget)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which approaches offer the best value for money? • Which approaches are the most cost-effective? • What is the return on the investment?
Activity and investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the delivery timely in terms of the plan? • What has been delivered? • Who has activity been delivered to? • Who has delivered the activity? • How much did it cost? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which approaches have been most successful? • Which interventions have had the most impact? • What evidence is there for what works and in what context? • Can any conclusions be drawn from the evidence about how transferable the results might be to other contexts?
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many (number) in each ward are being reached by intensive and non-intensive activity, by age and school year? • What percentage of the ward cohort is being reached by intensive and non-intensive activity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How successful has the programme been in targeting (through design and implementation) and delivering activities to the target groups in the identified wards? • What interventions work for which learners? • How do consortia compare? • Is there wider learning and best practice that can be transferred or shared?

Aspect	Monitoring will measure	Evaluation will measure
Achievement of milestones and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are milestones and aims being met? • What are the immediate and medium-term outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How successful have consortia been? What have been and are the key challenges for universities, colleges and other partners? • How have consortia measured their success? • How credible, valid and reliable are the data used and the evidence produced? • What are the key factors that have influenced whether consortia are successful? • How successfully have learner and school needs been determined and addressed?
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the consortium delivering on its project plan, objectives and milestones? • Is consortium staffing adequate and appropriate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How successfully have consortia identified and managed risks? • How successfully have consortia aligned their work with broader coverage of outreach activity (such as that undertaken in pursuit of access agreement targets)? • How successfully have consortia sustained relationships and capacity built during previous programmes (for instance National Networks for Collaborative Outreach)?
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the consortium delivering on its project plan, objectives and milestones? • Are there concerns about governance and/or management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How important has it been for consortia to adopt a strategic approach? What are the benefits and challenges?
Local context, partners and stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which partners are involved? • What is their role? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How agile have consortia been in adjusting to the developing local and national context?

Aspect	Monitoring will measure	Evaluation will measure
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities and challenges has this presented? To what extent might the local context explain what works and why? • What do consortia and their stakeholders (schools, colleges, learners, parents, other organisations) believe the benefits and the lessons learnt from the programme to be? What evidence do they have to support this? • What features of the consortia are likely to be sustained in the longer term and what may be needed to secure this activity?

	Monitoring and Account Management	Local evaluation	Quantitative analysis of national data sets	Econometric analysis – return on investment	Longitudinal tracking	Formative evaluation and capacity building	Impact evaluation – experimental approaches
Objective met	Accountability Benchmarking	Benchmarking Return on Investment What works	Benchmarking Impact Return on Investment	Impact Return on Investment	Benchmarking Impact What works	Benchmarking Impact What works	Impact What works
Concerned with	Inputs and outputs	Outputs and outcomes	Outcomes and impact	Impact	Outputs, outcomes and impact	Outputs and outcomes (potential for impact)	Outcomes and impact
Lead organisation	HEFCE policy team	Individual or groups of consortia	HEFCE analysts	HEFCE analysts and externally commissioned peer review	Higher Education Access Tracker, East Midlands Widening Participation Research and Evaluation Partnership and Aimhigher West Midlands	Externally commissioned via UK Shared Business Services (SBS) Research and Evaluation framework	Externally commissioned via SBS R&E framework
Key areas covered	Ongoing account management Quarterly financial monitoring	Locally determined approach as set out in operating plans Adapts to take account of national	Key Stage 4 and 5 behavioural change Entrant, attainment and progression data using	Econometric modelling	Tracking of target learners at local and national level to evaluate the impact of particular interventions on National Collaborative	Ongoing formative evaluation of the programme Support for local consortia in developing	Consequential changes resulting from the diversity of National Collaborative Outreach

	Monitoring and Account Management	Local evaluation	Quantitative analysis of national data sets	Econometric analysis – return on investment	Longitudinal tracking	Formative evaluation and capacity building	Impact evaluation – experimental approaches
	Twice-yearly monitoring against operating plan In-depth annual report	evaluation teams' recommendations Uses tracking data	national administrative data sets		Outreach Programme learners	and implementing high-quality evaluation plans Systematic review of emerging evidence	Programme interventions, by using a range of quantitative, experimental methodologies

Annex C: Account manager list

Each consortium has been allocated an 'account manager' who will be its contact at HEFCE. All account managers are part of the Student Opportunity team at HEFCE¹².

NCOP Consortia	Accountable institution	Account Manager
Aimhigher West Midlands	The University of Birmingham	Gemma Cadogan
Aspire Higher	University of Hertfordshire	Marcell Philips
Aspire to HE	The University of Wolverhampton	Marcell Philips
Cumbria Collaborative Outreach Programme	The University of Cumbria	Cassie Agbehenu
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Collaborative Outreach Programme	University of Derby	Gemma Cadogan
Essex Collaborative Outreach Network	The University of Essex	Marcell Philips
FORCE (The University of Hull Federation of Regional Colleges for Engagement)	The University of Hull	Cassie Agbehenu
Future Quest	University of the West of England, Bristol	Anju Kataria
Future U	University of Central Lancashire	Cassie Agbehenu
GROWS (GAP)	University of Gloucestershire	Anju Kataria
Go Higher West Yorkshire	The University of Leeds	Cassie Agbehenu
Greater Manchester Higher	Manchester Metropolitan University	Cassie Agbehenu
HEPP SY	Sheffield Hallam University	Cassie Agbehenu
Higher Horizons+	University of Keele	Cassie Agbehenu
Higher York	York St John University	Cassie Agbehenu
Kent and Medway Collaborative Outreach Programme	The University of Kent	Marcell Phillips
LINC Higher	Bishop Grosseteste University	Grace Simpson

¹² Account manager contact details can be found at www.hefce.ac.uk/sas/engage/.

London NCOP	Kingston University	Marcell Philips
Merseyside Collaborative Outreach Programme	The University of Liverpool	Cassie Agbehenu
Network for East Anglian Collaborative Outreach (NEACO)	University of Cambridge	Grace Simpson
Next Steps South West	University of Plymouth	Anju Kataria
North East Collaborative Outreach Programme	University of Newcastle upon Tyne	Cassie Agbehenu
Pathways	The University of Leicester	Marcell Philips
Southern Universities Network	University of Southampton	Anju Kataria
Study Higher	Oxford Brookes University	Anju Kataria
Sussex Learning Network	University of Brighton	Marcell Phillips
The Higher Education Outreach Network (HEON)	The University of Surrey	Marcell Phillips
Think Higher	The University of Warwick	Marcell Philips
Wessex Inspiration Network	The University of Bath	Anju Kataria

Annex D: Resource pool

NNCO and NCOP outreach resource repository information

1. We have created a repository¹³ for resources that networks and projects have developed under the NNCO, other outreach and social mobility schemes, or which complement the suite of resources available more generally. It is our expectation that the repository will capture the most effective resources and practices so that we can build a legacy from our programmes that will be useful across the sector. Importantly, the repository will act to share and disseminate effective practice and resources.

2. NNCO networks have submitted their resources to HEFCE and we are in the process of building up the Resource Pool. In time we will work with consortia to ensure new resources used as part of the NCOP are also included and we will contact consortia specifically about this.

3. Consortia are expected to bear the Resource Pool in mind as they design and deliver their activities, especially to ensure that the appropriate data protection and intellectual property rules are in place. We are grateful to HEAT for allowing us use the Higher Education Access Tracker (HEAT) typology as part of classifying the resources.

4. In terms of the intellectual ownership of resources, resources developed by institutions using funding are their own intellectual property (subject to their in-house rules and the normal rules of intellectual property – for instance, if a resource is part-developed by another party, arrangements might need to be clearly defined about intellectual property ownership including how it is to be shared). While institutions can exploit their intellectual property as they see fit, HEFCE has always taken the view that resources developed for this type of common purpose should be made generally available for the benefit of the objectives of the NNCO and NCOP programmes, as well as the wider aim to widen participation to higher education.

5. In regard to the sharing of resources, we draw consortia's attention to the following intellectual property statement prepared for NNCO Resource Pool return, which should be considered as part of their planning:

¹³ The Resource Pool will be published in January 2017, when we will make the weblink available to consortia.

Intellectual property statement

In voluntarily making a submission to the repository, the rights holder is agreeing to deposit resources ['resources' is defined as any deposit submitted to the repository] and licence the resources to HEFCE under the terms of the Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 licence, in the knowledge that these will be made openly available on the repository website and may also be used, shared and adapted for any purpose, even commercially. In doing so, those depositing resources are declaring that they are the rights holders to the resources deposited, or have permission from the rights holder to deposit the resources if the rights are held by a third party and any necessary consents for the processing of personal data (including for photographs of identifiable individuals). For the resources offered under this arrangement, the rights holder further declares they have authority to grant, and hereby do grant, to HEFCE (and any successor body) a CC BY 4.0 licence to the resources. The rights holder confirms that any such act carried out by HEFCE under these licences will not infringe the rights of any third party.

HEFCE will, in turn, arrange for the resources to be accessible under CC BY 4.0. The full licence terms may be accessed at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>, and may be amended from time to time. In summary, licensees can:

- **Share** – copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- **Adapt** – remix, transform, and build upon the material

For any purpose, even commercially.

- **Exploit** the information commercially and non-commercially, for example by combining it with other information, or by including it in their own product or application.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as licensees follow the licence terms:

- **Attribution** – licensees must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the licence, and indicate if changes were made. Licensees may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses the licensee or the licensee's use.

In depositing resources in the repository you are agreeing to these ongoing licence terms.